

### REMARKS

Claim 1 and 7-20 have been cancelled without prejudice, claim 23 has been amended, and claims 24-37 have been added. No new matter has been added by virtue of the amendments. For instance, support for the new claims appears e.g. at pages 3 and 18 and the original claims of the application.

Claims 1, 7, 8, 11-17 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 over Chen et al. (U.S. Patent 6303263).

While Applicants disagree with the rejection, the only pending independent claim is claim 22, which was not rejected over Chen et al.

In view thereof, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 9, 10, 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Chen et al. (U.S. Patent 6303263).

As grounds for the rejection, the following is stated in the Office Action at page 4:

It is the Examiner's position that the amount of 10 wt% taught by Chen is close enough to the lower end of the present range of 11-15 wt% and to the lower end of the present range of at least about 12% that one skilled in the art would have expected them to have the same properties. Thus, the prior art's teaching of 10% would render the present ranges of 9, 10, 22 and 23 prima facie obvious.

The rejection is traversed.

As an initial matter, it is understood that Chen et al. is not applicable to at least new claims 33 and 34, which recite subject matter of former claim 1, which former claim was not rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Chen et al.

Chen et al. is cited for the top end of a range mentioned in the document. That top end value does not overlap with Applicants' claims.

Indeed, Chen et al. effectively *teaches against* that cited top end value – that is Chen et al. exemplifies much lower values. Indeed, *all the Chen et al. examples* disclose much lower values of photoactive compounds. Specifically, in the Chen et al. document:

At column 8, lines 17-18 of Chen et al. (Example 7): 4 wt.% di(t-butylphenyl)iodonium perfluorooctane sulfonate is reported.

At column 8, lines 39-40 of Chen et al. (Example 8): 2 wt.% triphenyl sulfonium triflate is reported.

At column 8, lines 59-60 of Chen et al. (Example 9): 4 wt.% di(t-butylphenyl)iodonium perfluorooctane sulfonate is reported.

At column 9, lines 11-12 of Chen et al. (Example 10): 2 wt.% triphenyl sulfonium triflate is reported.

Such a disclosure clearly does not present a prima facie case under Section 103. See Manual of Patent Examining Procedure §2143.03 ("To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.").

The Chen et al. document also provides absolutely no exemplification "exposing the photoresist coating layer to EUV radiation to form a photoresist relief image" as Applicants claim.

Attention also is directed to the previously filed Rule 132 Declaration of co-inventor Robert Brainard which includes comparative data showing superior performance of the photoresist compounds of the invention. Such a showing further rebuts any *prima facie* case of obviousness that may be contended.

In view thereof, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are requested.

Claims 1, 7, 8, 11-18 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Barclay et al. (U.S. Patent 6492086).

While Applicants disagree with the rejection, the only pending independent claim is claim 22, which was not rejected over Barclay et al.

In view thereof, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 1, 7-18, 20, 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Fedynyshyn (U.S. Patent 6783914). The Fedynyshyn document is cited for a general range. The rejection is traversed.

The Fedynyshyn document suffers from deficiencies as noted above with respect to the Chen et al. document. That is, the Fedynyshyn document nowhere exemplifies or other directs the skilled worker to use of the photoacid generator compounds or to exposure with EUV radiation as Applicants claim.

The Rule 132 Declaration of record is also noted.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are requested.

Claims 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Chen et al. (U.S. Patent 6103447). The rejection is traversed.

As an initial matter, it is understood that Chen et al. (U.S. Patent 6103447) is not applicable to at least new claims 33 and 34, which recite subject matter of former claim 1, which former claim was not rejected over Chen et al. (U.S. Patent 6103447).

Chen et al. (U.S. Patent 6103447) has the *exact same* inventors, assignee and filing date as Chen et al. (U.S. Patent 6303263).

Chen et al. (U.S. Patent 6103447) also has very similar disclosure as that of Chen et al. (U.S. Patent 6303263).

As with Chen et al. (U.S. Patent 6303263), Chen et al. (U.S. Patent 6103447) is cited for the top end of a range mentioned in the document. That cited top end value does not overlap with Applicants' claims.

Indeed, Chen et al. (U.S. Patent 6103447) effectively *teaches against* that cited top end value – that is Chen et al. (U.S. Patent 6103447) exemplifies much lower values. Indeed, *all the Chen et al.* (U.S. Patent 6103447) *examples* disclose much lower values of photoactive compounds. Specifically, in the Chen et al. (U.S. Patent 6103447) document:

At column 8, lines 2-3 of Chen et al. (Example 4): 5 wt.% di(t-butylphenyl)iodonium perfluorooctane sulfonate is reported.

At column 8, lines 19-20 of Chen et al. (Example 5): 4 wt.% di(t-butylphenyl)iodonium perfluorooctane sulfonate is reported.

At column 8, lines 58-59 of Chen et al. (Example 6): 4 wt.% di(t-butylphenyl)iodonium perfluorooctane sulfonate is reported.

At column 9, lines 30-31 of Chen et al. (Example 7): 4 wt.% di(t-butylphenyl)iodonium perfluorooctane sulfonate is reported.

At column 10, lines 1-2 of Chen et al. (Example 8): 2 wt.% triphenyl sulfonium triflate is reported.

At column 10, lines 28-29 of Chen et al. (Example 9): 4 wt.% di(t-butylphenyl)iodonium perfluorooctane sulfonate is reported.

As discussed above, such a disclosure clearly does not present a prima facie case under Section 103. See Manual of Patent Examining Procedure §2143.03 ("To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.").

Chen et al. (U.S. Patent 6103447) also provides absolutely no exemplification "exposing the photoresist coating layer to EUV radiation to form a photoresist relief image" as Applicants claim.

In view thereof, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are requested.

It is believed that the application is in condition for immediate allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Brainard et al.  
U.S.S.N. 09/870,243  
Page 10

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'P. Corless', written in a cursive style.

Peter F. Corless (Reg. 33,860)  
EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE LLP  
P.O. Box 55874  
Boston, MA 02205  
(617) 439-4444